Re: Implementable Set Theory and Consistency of ZFC

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−10/msg05693.html

- *From*: David C. Ullrich <ullrich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

- *Date*: Tue, 30 Oct 2007 06:01:24 −0600

On Mon, 29 Oct 2007 15:35:33 +0100, Han de Bruijn
<Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

> Jesse F. Hughes wrote:
>
> > Han de Bruijn <Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:
> >
> > Jesse F. Hughes wrote:
> >
> > > Han de Bruijn
> > > <Han.deBruijn@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:
> > >
> > > Jesse F. Hughes wrote:
> > >
> > > > Even
> > > > assuming
> > > > that there
> > > > are four
> > > > models
> > > > rather than
> > > > one, so
> > > > what?
> > > > The point is
> > > > that you
> > > > have *not*
> > > > given a
> > > > proof of
> > > > (5)−(8)
> > > > using only
> > > > axioms
> > > > (1)−(4).
> > > > Thus, you

have not
done what
you said.
Even if you
show that
there are
seven
models for
(1)−(4) in
which
(5)−(8) are
also true,
you haven't
done what
you said.
Even if you
show there
are
infinitely
many
models
satisfying
this
condition,
you
haven't
done what
you said.
So, perhaps
you should
either do
what
you said or
change your
claim.

No. Because _nothing_
sensible ever counts as a
proof in your conception
of mathematics.

Quite wrong. I've told you what counts as a
proof of the claim that
(5)−(8) are theorems of (1)−(4). Namely, a
proof of each of (5)−(8)
using only (1)−(4) as axioms.
What is so controversial about that?

> Nothing. I've done just _that_ in my article.

> > Weird. How come no one else can recognize that you've done that?

> You forget that 'sci.math' is not "no one else". It's a relatvely small
> Internet Cafe, with some really weird inhabitants.

giggle. No argument there.

> > Also, if you *had* done that, then axioms (1)−(4) + (9) would be
> > sufficient for ZFC. Don't you find it a touch odd that no one else
> > has noticed this fascinating fact?

> The fact that Infinity X is an axiom of standard ZFC makes it necessary,
> it seems, to include the axioms (5−9), in order to make infinite sets
> make more "look alike" finite sets.

Wow. I mean really, wow. You claim that 5−8 follow from 1−4, but
somehow if we add 9 then we also need to include 5−8 as axioms?

This is _incredibly_ stupid. You really have no conception of
what it means to say A follows from B.

> Which wouldn't have been necessary
> with a more realistic approach (I mean, e.g. Choice is provable within
> the realm of finite sets, as is well known).

> > You *do* know that if (1)−(4) prove (5)−(8), then so do (1)−(4) + (9),
> > right?

> I can't do any sensible reasoning with Infinity (9 = X right?) included.

That's evidently not the only circumstance where you can't do
any sensible reasoning. I mean wow.

> Han de Bruijn

****

David C. Ullrich

.